



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, DC 20231

TS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/868,407 06/03/97 GERSZBERG

I. 38-33-29

LM12/0801

EXAMINER

S H DWORETSKY
AT&T CORP
P O BOX 4110
MIDDLETON NJ 07748

ARMSTRONG, D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2749

12

DATE MAILED:

08/01/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Ranell Armstrong
703-306-3015



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF
PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

JUL 3 1 2000

Group 2700

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 12

Application Number: 08/868,407

Filing Date: 06/03/97

Appellant(s): Irwin GERSZBERG et al.

For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed 5/15/00.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 2745

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Invention

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Issues

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) Grouping of Claims

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-26 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) ClaimsAppealed

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) Prior Art of Record

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

5,504,804

Widmark et al.

4-1996

(10) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). This rejection is set forth in prior Office action, Paper No. 7.

Art Unit: 2745

(11) Response to Argument

As to the applicant's argument that Widmark does not disclose or suggest a method having the step of accessing a data base at a base station containing dialing instructions for a wireless station for a rapidly-established telephone connection through a public switched telephone network to a destination station, the examiner disagrees. Widmark discloses a base station (704,715), a data base (718), PSTN (709). Moreover, the examiner states that Widmark discloses the importance of rapid incorporation service for the establishment of communication as disclosed column 6, lines 25-29. Furthermore, Widmark exhibits direct connections between the mobile (502) and the MSC (504), MSC(504) and database (HLR (507)) and MSC(504), and a land line phone (501) and the PSTN (509) these connection would inherently be for no other reason then for rapid-established telephone connections. Dedicated lines of connection are extremely well known in the art as demonstrated in the prior art of record. Moreover, Widmark states that "the old approach of distributing responsibility for invoking services between different nodes in the network...requires more time and effort" (see column 9, lines 18-25). Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

As to the applicant argument that Widmark does not disclose or suggest a base station is which the stored voice signals are transmitted to he destination station when a call is connected through the PSTN, the examiner disagrees. Moreover, Widmark discloses a call connected to the destination through the PSTN receiving a prompt to state whether this is an

Art Unit: 2745

"important call" or not, as disclosed column 7, line 60 through column 8, line 10. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

D.R.A.
July 29, 2000


DANIEL S. HUNTER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W., 11 th floor
Washington, D.C., 20001-4597